



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/560,866

02/02/2007

Anwar Bashir

B827.312-0001

3764

164 7590 05/14/2008

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 SOUTH THIRD STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1002

EXAMINER

RAHMAN, SABANA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4133

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/560,866	Applicant(s) BASHIR, ANWAR	
	Examiner SABANA RAHMAN	Art Unit 4133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to application filed on February 2, 2007 in which claims 1-28 are presented for examination.

Status of claim

Claims 1-28 are pending and are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a).

Drawings

Drawing Fig. 1, 1A and 1B should be objected to because they only showed a plurality of empty boxes without necessary indicating what they represent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,4-5,9-17 and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Louis Wallace et al (US Pub. No. 2002/0046221), in view of Gavlik (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,502).

With respect to claim 1, Louis teaches, “a control system for controlling a physical device including a computer (see at Fig. 1B. (Computer), a controlled device (see at Para. [0058] (printer)) ; wherein the micro-controller software is programmed to generate a hypertext transfer protocol request (http) upon receipt of an input signal by

the micro-controller input means (see at Para. [0031]), which request is transmitted to the computer via the output means, wherein the transmission of data from the device to the computer is performed by the micro-controller, and wherein the micro-controlled software is programmed to receive text data contained in a web page, the said data including control information(at Para. [0014]), and upon receipt of such data the micro-controller software identifies the control information contained in the web page,” (at Para. [0015]).

It appears Louis fails to explicitly disclose “a micro-controller having input means and output means; the controller including micro-controller software and allows a control signal to be sent from the computer to the controlled device”.

However, Gavlik discloses a micro-controller having input means and output means; the controller including micro-controller software, and allows a control signal to be sent from the computer to the controlled device in col. 2, lines 23-36, lines 47-51 and col.4 ,lines 51-60, (a microcontroller capable of controlling the physical layer interface)

Louis and Gavlik are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of control system.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Louis and Gavlik before him or her, to modify Louis 's database such that it would have a micro-controller having input means and output means.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the physical layer to be reprogrammed or upgraded easily without using programmable logic array (PLA) circuits to control state machines (at col.2, lines 4-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Louis with Gavlik to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim1.

With respect to claim 2, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 1, wherein the text data contained in the web page is written in Hypertext Markup Language (HTML)” at Para. [0011], [0079] (the web page is written in HTML format).

With respect to claim 4, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 1, wherein the controlled device receives a control signal via the micro-controller, the control signal causing the controlled device to perform an operation dependent on the nature of the information carried by the control signal” at Para. [0012].

With respect to claim 5, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 1, wherein the computer receives the http requests generated by the micro-controller (see at “abstract” and Para. [0013]) and generates an output signal contained within text data in a web page for transmission to the micro-controller (at Para. [0013]), and wherein on receipt of the said output signal the micro-controller performs a control operation on the controlled device” (at Para. [0058]).

With respect to claim 9, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 1, further including a database” at Para. [0013], (Web site database).

With respect to claim 10, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 9, wherein the system compares information associated with an http request from the micro-controller with information stored on the database (see at Para. [0014]), and wherein if the comparison meets a criteria the computer generates a control signal for controlling the device, and if the comparison does not meet a criteria the computer does not generate a control signal for controlling the device” at Para. [0099], [0095] (see Fig.26).

With respect to claim 11, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 9, wherein events that occur in the system are recorded in the database” at Para. [0082].

With respect to claim 12, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 11, wherein http requests generated by the micro-controller software are recorded in the database” at Para. [0046] and [0097] (PLC)

With respect to claim 13, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 1, wherein the said micro-controller is part of the said computer” at Para. [0016].

With respect to claim 14, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 1, wherein the controlled device is a machine tool” at Para.[0058] and [0057].

As to claim 15, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 14, further including a database, and wherein the machine tool (see at Para. [0058], adapter) sends a signal to the micro-controller via the input means requesting machining instructions (see at Para. [0058]), and wherein the micro-controller generates an http request requesting the machining instructions from the computer, and the computer interrogates the database for machining instructions for the said machine tool, and wherein if instructions for the said machine tool are located on the database, the said instructions are transmitted via the computer to the micro-controller with a control signal contained in a web page commanding the micro-controller to allow passage of the said instructions to the said machine tool” at Para. [0099], [0058] and (see Fig. 14, (http request)).

With respect to claim 16, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 14, wherein the machine tool sends a signal to the micro-controller via the input means identifying the said machine tool, and wherein the micro-controller generates an http request to the computer requesting processing information unique to the said machine tool, and wherein the said unique processing information is applied to instructions transmitted to the said machine tool” at Para. [0015] and [0096].

With respect to claim 17, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 1, wherein the controlled device is a printer, or a photocopier, or a fax machine, or an access barrier” at Para. [0058].

With respect to claim 22, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 1, wherein the data contained in the text of the web page transmitted to the computer in response to an http request is marked” at Para. [0080] and [0096].

With respect to claim 23, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 22, wherein marking data consists of tabulating said data, or placing said data between computer readable markers” at Para. [0096].

With respect to claim 24, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 1, wherein the computer is a server” at Para. [0013] and [0055].

With respect to claim 25, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a control system according to claim 24, wherein the server is an Internet server, or is a network server” at Para. [0055].

With respect to claim 26, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a micro-controller suitable for use in a control system according to claim 1(see at “abstract” and Para. [0014]).

With respect to claim 27, Louis fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. However, Louis teaches, “a computer program comprising computer program instructions which, when loaded into the micro-controller constitute the micro-controller software of the control system of claim 1” at Para.[0049]

With respect to claim 27, , Louis teaches, “a method of controlling a physical device using a control system according to claim 1, comprising the following steps: ii) transmitting data from the device to the computer via the micro-controller” at Para. [0014] and iv) enabling a control signal to be sent from the computer to the controlled device” at Para. [0012] and [0058] (adapter).

It appears Louis fails to explicitly disclose ,“i) “the micro-controller software generates an http request upon receipt of an input signal by the micro-controller input means” and (iii) the micro-controller software receives a web page containing text data and identifies control information contained in the text data”.

However, Gavlik discloses, “ the micro-controller software is program” at col. 2, lines 23-36, lines 47-51 and col.4 ,lines 51-60, (the microcontroller in a second operating mode downloads the downloadable software control program from an external processing system and executes the software control program in place of the embedded control program to thereby control the physical layer interface. (see at “abstract”))

Louis and Gavlik are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of control system.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Louis and Gavlik before him or her, to modify Louis's database such that it would have a micro-controller software.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the physical layer to be reprogrammed or upgraded easily without using programmable logic array (PLA) circuits to control state machines (at col.2, lines 4-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Louis with Gavlik to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim 28.

29. (canceled)

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Louis (US. Pub. No. 2002/0046221) as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of Gao et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0112274), hereinafter referred to as "Gao".

Regarding claim 3, which is depends on claim 1, Louis discloses the claim invention as "a control system for controlling a physical device including a computer (see at Fig. 1B. (Computer), a controlled device (see at Para.[0058] (printer)), and a micro-controller having input means and output means (see at Para. [0058]) the controller including micro-controller software, wherein the micro-controller software is programmed to generate a hypertext transfer protocol request (http) upon receipt of an input signal by the micro-controller input means (see at Para. [0031]), which request is transmitted to the computer via the output means, wherein the transmission of data from the device to the computer is performed by the micro-controller, and wherein the micro-controlled

software is programmed to receive text data contained in a web page, the said data including control information(at Para. [0014]), and upon receipt of such data the micro-controller software identifies the control information contained in the web page, and allows a control signal to be sent from the computer to the controlled device” (at Para. [0015]).

Louis does not appear to explicitly disclose “A control system according to claim 1, wherein the text date contained in the web page is written in the American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII)”.

However, Gao teaches, “A control system according to claim 1, wherein the text date contained in the web page is written in the American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII)” at Para. [0055] (ASCII char 001).

Louis and Gao are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of database and control system.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Louis and Gao before him or her, to modify Louis’s database such that it would have an American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII).

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the capability to synchronize the data structure of a displayed HTML UI control in a web page with its corresponding data structure stored in an information system at a server, without refreshing the web page (at Para. [0021])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gao with Louise to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim 3.

Claims 6, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Louis (US. Pub. No. 2002/0046221) as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of Hsu et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0010710), hereinafter referred to as "Hsu".

Regarding claim 6, which is depends on claim 1, Louis discloses the claim invention as "a control system for controlling a physical device including a computer (see at Fig. 1B. (Computer), a controlled device (see at Para.[0058] (printer)), and a micro-controller having input means and output means (see at Para. [0058]) the controller including micro-controller software, wherein the micro-controller software is programmed to generate a hypertext transfer protocol request (http) upon receipt of an input signal by the micro-controller input means (see at Para. [0031]), which request is transmitted to the computer via the output means, wherein the transmission of data from the device to the computer is performed by the micro-controller, and wherein the micro-controlled software is programmed to receive text data contained in a web page, the said data including control information(at Para. [0014]), and upon receipt of such data the micro-controller software identifies the control information contained in the web page, and allows a control signal to be sent from the computer to the controlled device" (at Para. [0015]).

Louis does not appear to explicitly disclose "a control system according to claim 1, wherein the micro-controller includes a filter, the filter allowing passage of control

information contained within the text data, and preventing passage of other data contained within the text data”.

However, Hus teaches, “a control system according to claim 1, wherein the micro-controller includes a filter (at Para.[0042]), the filter allowing passage of control information contained within the text data, and preventing passage of other data contained within the text data” at Para. [0040] [0041] and [0042].

Louis and Hsu are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of database and control system.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Louis and Gao before him or her, to modify Louis’s database such that it would have a filter, the filter allowing passage of control information contained within the text data, and preventing passage of other data contained within the text data

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the security control for a request to access a web site is provided efficiently, since the user’s identity is conveniently managed without modifying existing codes (at Para. [0012])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hsu with Louise to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim 6.

Regarding claim 7, which is depends on claim 1, Louis discloses the claim invention as “a control system for controlling a physical device including a computer (see at Fig. 1B. (Computer), a controlled device (see at Para.[0058] (printer)), and a micro-controller having input means and output means (see at Para. [0058]) the controller including

micro-controller software, wherein the micro-controller software is programmed to generate a hypertext transfer protocol request (http) upon receipt of an input signal by the micro-controller input means (see at Para. [0031]), which request is transmitted to the computer via the output means, wherein the transmission of data from the device to the computer is performed by the micro-controller, and wherein the micro-controlled software is programmed to receive text data contained in a web page, the said data including control information(at Para. [0014]), and upon receipt of such data the micro-controller software identifies the control information contained in the web page, and allows a control signal to be sent from the computer to the controlled device” (at Para. [0015]).

Louis does not appear to explicitly disclose “A control system according to claim 1, wherein the filter is a text parser”.

However, Hsu teaches, “A control system according to claim 1, wherein the filter is a text parser” at Para. [0019] and [0033].

Louis and Hsu are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of database and control system.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Louis and Gao before him or her, to modify Louis’s database such that it would have a text parser.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the security control for a request to access a web site is provided efficiently, since the user’s identity is conveniently managed without modifying existing codes (at Para. [0012])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hsu with Louise to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim 7.

As to claim 8, Hsu teaches, “a control system according to claim 7, wherein the text parser is an HTML parser” at Para. [0028] and [0033].

Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Louis (US. Pub. No. 2002/0046221) as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Fung et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0055909), hereinafter referred to as “Fung”.

Regarding claim 18, which is depends on claim 17, Louis discloses the claim invention as “a control system according to claim 1, wherein the controlled device is a printer, or a photocopier, or a fax machine, or an access barrier” at Para. [0058].

Louis does not appear to explicitly disclose “A control system according to claim 17, wherein the micro-controller input means is a swipe card reader, and wherein personally identified information related to the controlled device is stored on the computer, and when a swipe card is passed through the swipe card reader an http request including the personal identity of the card holder is sent to the computer, and wherein the said personally identified information held on the computer having a personal identity matching the personal identity transmitted in the http request is transmitted to the micro-controller, and wherein the micro-controller transmits information release data to the computer which transmits the information to the controlled device via the micro-controller”.

However, Fung teaches, “A control system according to claim 17, wherein the micro-controller input means is a swipe card reader, and wherein personally identified

information related to the controlled device is stored on the computer, and when a swipe card is passed through the swipe card reader an http request including the personal identity of the card holder is sent to the computer, and wherein the said personally identified information held on the computer having a personal identity matching the personal identity transmitted in the http request is transmitted to the micro-controller, and wherein the micro-controller transmits information release data to the computer which transmits the information to the controlled device via the micro-controller” at Para. [0090] and [0203].

Louis and Fung are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of database and control system.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Louis and Fung before him or her, to modify Louis's database such that it would have a swipe card reader.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the ease and efficiency of the central Web site according to the present invention will help induce more people to begin to use the Internet. (at Para. [0171])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Fung with Louise to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim 7.

As to claim 19, Fung teaches, “a control system according to claim 18, wherein the system further comprises an inter-active display, and wherein information held on the computer having a personal identity matching the personal identity transmitted in the http request are displayed on the inter-active display” at Para. [0089].

As to claim 20, Fung teaches, “a control system according to claim 19, wherein the information displayed on the inter-active display may be manually selected using the inter-active display” at Para. [0056].

As to claim 21, Fung teaches, “a control system according to claim 19, wherein the personally identified information comprises print jobs, or photocopier jobs, or fax jobs, or access permissions” at Para. [0089].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gregory N. Stewart (US Patent No. 5,410,711) discloses a portable computer with Bios- Independent Power Management.

Rosa et al (US Patent No. 5,618,441) discloses a single microcontroller execution of control and safety system function in a dialysis machine.

Richard A Baker (US Patent No. 7,035,898 B1) discloses the system for programming a factory automation device using a web browser.

Rogers et al (US. Patent No. 5,974,441) discloses WWW client server interactive method with Java.

Fujita et al (US Pub. No. 2004/0243924) discloses a content Administration system.

Richard C. Walker (US Pub. No. 2003/0221118) discloses the automated accounting system that values, controls, records and bills.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabana Rahman whose telephone number is 571-270-5204. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 5:00 pm, Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frantz Coby can be reached on 571-272-4017. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SR

Data: 05/08/2008

/Sabana Rahman/

Examiner, Art Unit 4133

/Frantz Coby/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 4133

